Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01378 201210 Z

20
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 SS-14 SCI-06 EPA-04 OST-04 HEW-08

DOTE-00 INT-08 HUD-02 DODE-00 CEQ-02 EB-11 IO-12

NSC-10 COME-00 OMB-01 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-09 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

MBFR-03 SAJ-01 /161 W
---------- 099062
R 201114 Z MAR 73
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9423
INFO SECDEF WASHDC
ALL NATO CAPITALS 2795
AMEMBASSY HELSINKI
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 1378

E. O. 11652: GDS, 12-31-79
TAGS: PFOR
SUBJECT: CSCE: SWISS PROPOSAL

HELSINKI FOR USDEL MPT

REF: STATE 49869

SUMMARY. INITIAL DISCUSSION AT MARCH 19 SENIOR POLADS
MEETING OF TACTICS FOR HANDLING SWISS PROPOSAL FOR SYSTEM
FOR PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES (PSD) REVEALED GENERAL SUPPORT
(MINUS TURKEY) FOR ITS INCLUSION UNDER AGENDA ITEM I. SOME
DELEGATIONS EXPRESSED DOUBTS THAT SEPARATE SUB- COMMITTEE WAS
ADVISABLE. US REDRAFT OF SWISS MANDATE WAS GENERALLY WELL
RECEIVED.
END SUMMARY.

1. OPENING DISCUSSION, SPC CHAIRMAN NOTED THAT SWISS MANDATE
SEEMED VERY GENERAL AND WOULD COMMIT ALLIES TO NOTHING
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01378 201210 Z

MORE THAN CONSIDERING MORE DETAILED PROPOSAL AT CSCE
ITSELF. TURKISH REP ADVISED THAT ANKARA COULD NOT ACCEPT

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

SWISS PROPOSAL UNDER ITEM I AND BELIEVED IT SHOULD BE
DISCUSSED UNDER ITEM IV (FOLLOW- UP). HE EXPLAINED THAT
ANKARA SAW SWISS PROPOSAL AS COUNTERWEIGHT TO SOVIET
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE IDEA. IN ADDITION, HE NOTED THAT
DURING POLADS EXAMINATION OF SWISS PROPOSAL THERE HAD BEEN
CONSIDERABLE SUPPORT FOR POSITION THAT TRIBUNAL FORMED
UNDER IT SHOULD NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OVER POLITICAL/
MILITARY QUESTIONS.

2. US REP SAID WE SUPPORTED TURKISH VIEW THAT POLITICAL/
MILITARY QUESTIONS SHOULD BE KEPT OUT OF PURVIEW OF TRIBUNAL
FORMED UNDER SWISS PROPOSAL, BUT HE ADDED THAT WE BELIEVED A
BETTER MEANS TO THIS END WOULD BE TO REDRAFT MANDATE TABLED
BY SWISS. US REP DREW ON REFTEL AND CIRCULATED TEXT
CONTAINED PARA 2. US TEXT WAS GENERALLY WELL RECEIVED.
NETHERLANDS REP SAID HE COULD SUPPORT IT AND SEVERAL OTHER REPS
SAID THEY COULD JOIN ANY CONSENSUS WHICH FORMED IN ITS
SUPPORT. WITH REFERENCE TO TURKISH POSITION THAT SWISS
PROPOSAL SHOULD BE CONSIDERED UNDER ITEM IV, NETHERLANDS REP
SAID THIS WOULD MEAN THAT SEPARATE COMMITTEE, IN ADDITION
TO COORDINATING COMMITTEE, WOULD HAVE TO BE FORMED AND WAS
THEREFORE UNACCEPTABLE. MOST OTHER DELEGATIONS TOOK SIMILAR
POSITION, AND TURKISH REP SAID HE WOULD SEEK FURTHER
INSTRUCTIONS.

3. BELGIAN REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES HAD DOUBTS ABOUT
WISDOM OF CREATING SEPARATE SUB- COMMITTEE FOR SWISS
PROPOSAL. THIS WOULD, HE SUGGESTED, GIVE IT TOO MUCH
IMPORTANCE. AS ALTERNATIVES, HE SUGGESTED THAT REFERENCE
TO SWISS PROPOSAL EITHER BE INCLUDED IN MANDATE FOR PARENT
COMMITTEE OR IN MANDATE FOR SUB- COMMITTEE ON PRINCIPLES.
LATTER ALTERNATIVE, HE NOTED, WOULD HAVE ADVANTAGE OF
TIEING SWISS PROPOSAL TO PRINCIPLE OF NON- USE OF FORCE,
AS SWISS SUGGESTED. FRENCH REP SAID PARIS ALSO HAD DOUBTS
ON SEPARATE SUB- COMMITTEE BUT ADDED THAT THIS QUESTION
DEPENDED, TO LARGE DEGREE, ON RESOLUTION OF OVERALL
DISAGREEMENT ON NEED TO SPECIFY TASKS OF SUB- COMMITTEES.
HE ADDED THAT PARIS CONTINUED HAVE PROBLEMS WITH SOME
ASPECTS OF SWISS PROPOSAL AND SUPPORTED ITS INSCRIPTION
LARGELY AS TACTICAL MEASURE.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01378 201210 Z

4. CANADIAN REP ASKED WHETHER US HAD ANY IDEAS ON
MODALITIES OF TABLING ITS REVISED MANDATE, ASSUMING IT WAS
ACCEPTED BY ALLIES. US REP SAID WE HAD NO FIRM IDEAS ON THIS
POINT AND BELIEVED THIS WAS APPROPRIATE SUBJECT TO BE
DISCUSSED AT FUTURE MEETING ALTHOUGH DELEGATIONS IN HELSINKI
MIGHT BE BETTER PLACED TO COMMENT ON THIS. (COMMENT: UK REP
AFTER THE MEETING SUGGESTED AN A

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 20 MAR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO01378
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730346/abqcdxge.tel
Line Count: 106
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 2
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 49869
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 02 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <14-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: SWISS PROPOSAL
TAGS: PFOR
To: STATE INFO SECDEF
ALL NATO CAPITALS
HELSINKI
MOSCOW
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005